

1
2
3
4
5
6 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
7
8 FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
9

10 NEW SENSATIONS, INC., a California
11 corporation,

No. C 10-05863 WHA

12 Plaintiff,

13 v.

**ORDER REGARDING
PRÉCIS REQUESTS**

14 DOES 1–1745,

15 Defendants.
16 _____/

17 An anonymous litigant claiming to have the Internet Protocol address associated with
18 defendant Doe Number 733 seeks leave to file a variety of motions (Dkt. No. 33). Plaintiff did
19 not respond. Having considered the précis, this order provides that Doe 733 may proceed
20 as follows.

21 *First*, before making any other filings, Doe 733 must disclose his or her identity to the
22 Court and the parties. Doe 733 may do so by filing a disclosure statement under seal. As
23 explained in the order striking Doe 733’s anonymous motion to dismiss (Dkt. No. 28), no litigant
24 may participate in this action without informing at least the Court and the parties of his or
25 her identity.


26 *Second*, after disclosing his or her identity under seal, Doe 733 may file a motion for leave
27 to proceed anonymously in *public* filings. The motion should be filed in the public docket and
28 noticed to be heard on the normal 35-day track. Pending resolution of that motion, the

1 pseudonym "Doe 733" may be used in public filings. Counsel are advised that the public has a
2 strong interest in knowing litigants' identities, and that permission to proceed anonymously will
3 be granted only for good cause shown in the most unusual cases. *See, e.g., Does I thru XXIII v.*
4 *Advanced Textile Corp.*, 214 F.3d 1058, 1067–68 (9th Cir. 2000). It is unlikely that this is such a
5 case, but the decision will be made after the parties have a full opportunity to brief the issue.
6 Thus, the request by Doe 733 for permission to file a motion to proceed under a pseudonym is
7 **GRANTED** with the foregoing constraints and caveats.

8 *Third*, the requests by Doe 733 for permission to file a motion to dismiss the complaint
9 and a motion to quash the subpoena directed to Cablevision are **DENIED**. The précis does not
10 explain the basis for those proposed motions, so it is impossible to determine whether they are
11 likely to succeed or materially advance the action. This denial is without prejudice to renewal of
12 the requests after the identity of Doe 733 is disclosed under seal and the question of his or her
13 public anonymity is resolved.

14
15 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

16
17 Dated: July 8, 2011.

18 
19 _____
20 WILLIAM ALSUP
21 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
22
23
24
25
26
27
28